

71 545

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT OF THE DNIEPER IN BELARUS AND RUSSIA (EMDDBR)

MONITORING REPORT 5



Submitted to:
Central and Eastern Europe Branch,
Canadian International Development Agency

Submitted by:
IRIS Environmental Systems Inc.

September 2003

Document # ARM031

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	MONITORING SOURCES	2
3.0	PROGRAM STATUS	3
3.1	Status of Projects under the Program	3
3.2	Verify Progress in Achieving Results	6
3.2.1	Attainment of Expected Outputs	6
3.2.2	Attainment of Expected Outcomes	10
3.2.3	Attainment of Expected Impact Results	12
3.3	Monitor Achievement of Key Success Factors	13
3.4	Monitoring and Reporting Systems	15
4.0	CONCLUSIONS	16
5.0	RECOMMENDATIONS	17

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This is the fifth and final monitoring report for the Environmental Management Development of the Dnieper in Belarus and Ukraine (EMDDBR) Program.

Drawing on its experience in the region through the implementation of both phases of the Environmental Management Development in Ukraine (EMDU) Program, the Office of Central and Eastern European Initiatives (OCEEI), a unit of the International Development and Research Centre (IDRC), has been working in parallel with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and Russia, Belarus and Ukraine, to develop a Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the management of the Dnieper River Basin. This trans-boundary programme is to address basin management from the river's source in Russia and its course through Belarus and Ukraine to its exit into the Black Sea. The long term objectives of the programme are to remedy the serious environmental effects of pollution and habitat degradation, to ensure sustainable use of resources, and to protect biodiversity in the Dnieper River Basin.

In order for Belarus and Russia to participate as equal partners in the development of the SAP, it was deemed mete to enhance their capacity by addressing management structures and strategies related to the river, establishing baseline data on river quality, increasing the overall knowledge base on the river, and developing a GIS-based monitoring system in each country capable of integrating with systems already in place in Ukraine due to the two phases of the EMDU Program. The EMDDBR Program was developed and has been implemented to improve the local environmental management capacity of these two countries to prepare them to participate with Ukraine in the GEF Program. The primary contributor to its implementation is the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

By way of a Contribution Agreement executed between CIDA and OCEEI/IDRC in December 1999 and subsequent Memorandum of Grant Conditions, CIDA agreed to provide up to \$2 M in contributory funding to the EMDDBR Program.

By contract made May 18, 2000, CIDA hired an external Program Monitor (PM), IRIS Environmental Systems Inc. Further to his contract, the PM's specific monitoring objectives are to:

- verify the Program's progress in achieving its results;
- monitor achievement of key success factors; and,
- provide support to IDRC in developing and utilising Program monitoring and reporting systems.

The PM has no purview to monitor the financial aspects of Program implementation.

The duration of and resources within the PM's contract end with the submission of this report. The EMDDBR Program had originally been planned to end in March, 2003. A time extension has been granted it by CIDA but no further resources have been extended. Almost all projects and activities under the Program have been completed and the initiative is currently winding down. It is expected to remain intermittently active

to fiscal year end, essentially tracking the extended time frame of the UNDP's GEF for the finalisation of the SAP.

The PM notes and agrees with IDRC's suggested terminology for the implementation of the initiative. As a consequence, the PM will refer to the entirety of EMDDBR as the Program. Where the term Project is employed, it will refer to initiatives developed and initiated under the Program as projects, and will refer to sub-project activities as activities.

Note that the PM performs this assignment further to filed annual work plans. Under separate cover, the PM has filed a work plan reconciliation for its work plan for fiscal year 2001-2002 and filed a work plan for fiscal year 2002-2003. This monitoring report is consistent with its filed monitoring mission work plan, filed with CIDA in July, 2003.

2.0 MONITORING SOURCES

The PM draws on the following information sources in compiling this report:

- OCEEI/IDRC's Progress Report to CIDA, Report No. OCEEI.M05, 15 May 2003 reporting on the period 15 February – 15 May 2003.
- The PM's monitoring mission to Ukraine and Russia, September 20 – 30, 2003, as pre-approved by CIDA. Appendix "A" to this Report lists contacts made during the mission.
- E-mail correspondence with OCEEI/IDRC and CIDA Program personnel.

To gather data and information for this final monitoring report, the PM followed a methodology discussed with and approved by CIDA prior to his departure for the region. A simple mission questionnaire was developed that focussed on the Program's performance indicators to measure the achievement (or not) of expected outcome and impact results. This questionnaire preceded the PM's arrival. The questionnaire, provided electronically in English and Russian to the OCEEI/IDRC office in Ukraine, was also distributed to the Program's Russian partners. It was intended and was utilised as a guide to monitoring interviews; it was not intended or used as a formal sampling technique. Responses to the questionnaire were requested and received anonymously to enhance objectivity. In addition, the PM reviewed Interim and Final Project Reports regarding Projects funded under the EMDDBR Program.

The monitoring mission, due to resource constraints, did not include Belarus. This site was included in the PM's previous monitoring mission, the findings of which were included in Monitoring Report 4. As confirmed in that report, Belarus had made quick and strong progress in its projects under the Program. Given the resource constraints under which the September 2003 monitoring mission was conducted, a return to Belarus was considered redundant. As a consequence, in this report where the PM discusses the achievement (or not) of overall Program results the evidence of achievement as measured by indicators incorporates earlier findings from Belarus with the data gathered in Ukraine and Russia during the September 2003 mission.

3.0 PROGRAM STATUS

3.1 Status of Projects under the Program

The EMDDBR Program is comprised of five projects that were initially conceived to be implemented in both Russia and Belarus:

1. *Management Capacity Building and Assessments: carrying out a needs assessment, reviewing laws and practices, and establishing management structures to enable participation in the SAP and ultimately to manage the Dnieper River.*
 - establish committees and meeting structures whereby the national government, local governments, NGO representatives, and researchers can engage in developing strategies for river management and clean-up.
 - establishment of a river management committee in each country, Russian Management Committee (RMC) and Belarussian Management Committee (BMC), modelled after the successful Ukrainian Management Committee (UMC) used in EMDU.
 - review of national laws and policies in light of international experience.
 - conduct a needs assessment and produce a concept paper on river improvement and management for each country.
2. *Baselines: measurement of baseline levels of water quality within the river system against which progress can be measured.*
 - measure water quality indices from a large research vessel with open boats used for shallow water sampling. Samples will be taken of water at various depths and of bottom sediments, which are particularly important as repositories of heavy metal and radioactive pollutants.
 - sample marine vertebrates (fish) for levels of metals, radioactive and organic chemical pollutants such as pesticide residues, quantities of dissolved nutrients, and counts of indicator species of pathogenic organisms such as salmonella and e-coli bacteria.
 - record biodiversity of aquatic species, a measure of environmental health of the River, will also be recorded.
 - data will be collected using the same accuracy standards and presentation formats for both countries, with information entered into a GIS-based data bank. Results of the study will be compared with norms used in the countries for waters of various degrees of purity. It is anticipated that sampling and chemical, biological, and radiometric analyses will be conducted by research institutes within the two nations, with outside help where needed.
3. *Linkages: establishment of computer-based linkages between river management agencies and research labs in the countries.*
 - purchase and install computers at important river control sites like dams and pumping stations; government offices that make decisions with respect to regulating the river, monitoring toxic spills, and maintaining databases about the river; and research agencies dealing with the river

- develop and install software, allowing the agencies to communicate electronically within Russia and Belarus and among the three riparian nations
 - training end users
4. *Databases: creation of GIS-based information systems dealing with water quality issues.*
- develop geographically referenced (GIS-based) databases of river-related information such as chemical quality, biological quality, flow characteristics, etc.
 - compile data from widely distributed paper records, screened for quality, transformed into standardised presentation formats, and enter into databases with the capability to plot the data on maps, treat it statistically, and present aggregate data in various forms such as graphs and tables. Manipulation and interpretation of the data, using algorithms designed to answer questions of national importance, are desirable.
5. *Monitoring: set-up of monitoring stations and capacity at protected sites in national parks or nature preserves where river quality can be monitored on a long-term basis.*
- establish two monitoring sites in a national park or national nature preserve in both Russia and Belarus with equipment to monitor quality of the ambient environment.
 - complete a very thorough environmental inventory of a region near the monitoring site, which will include such items as biodiversity and health of the environment.
 - repeat inventories at five year intervals to track environmental change.
 - determine if interpretative programs for visitors to the park are a possibility and source external funding.

PM Comment on Program Status, By Project

Management Capacity Building and Assessments

Belarus:

The Belarus Management Committee (BMC) meets regularly. The project office is established and staffed. All Belarus projects under EMDDBR were approved and monitored by the Committee. The BMC has assumed responsibility for GEF projects as well. EMDDBR activities in Belarus are essentially complete with the exception of the groundwater assessment activity, dependent on methodologies just completed in Russia. The BMC is expected to continue with GEF SAP activities following the completion of the EMDDBR Program.

Russia:

The Russian Management Committee (RMC) meets regularly and approves and monitor activities under EMDDBR and GEF. The project office is established and staffed. Although the RMC was slow to develop appropriate projects under the Program therefore commencing project work later than expected, all projects now are approaching completion. One planned initiative, to review the relevant existing regulatory framework, was not approved; this work will be accomplished outside of the Program, by UNIDO, and form an input to the GEF SAP. For all projects, interim

reports have been filed and formal final reporting is expected within the next month or two. It is expected that the RMC will also work with the GEF SAP once the EMDDBR Program is completed.

Baselines**Belarus:**

All activities are complete and formal final reports filed and accepted by OECCI/IDRC. Results have been incorporated into GEF documents. An additional initiative, assessment of groundwater protection, has been undertaken. This is underway, but has had to await the completion of a similar initiative in Russia which is to develop and test methodologies to be used by all parties.

Russia:

Due to a late start, Russia participated in only one of the river expeditions. The final report has been filed and accepted. Funds originally allocated for additional work were re-programmed within the Program and have been utilised for additional computer linkages initiatives.

Linkages**Belarus:**

This project is complete with final reports filed and accepted by OECCI/IDRC.

Russia:

The first project, establishing seven linked computer nodes is complete and formal final reports filed and accepted. Utilising funds earlier planned for additional baseline (a second river expedition) a new initiative – Computer Linkages 2 - was approved and is well underway. It provides for additional hardware and software for over 20 linked computer nodes and will greatly enhance information transfer vertically and horizontally (i.e. federally and regionally) for basin management in Russia. An interim report has been filed and the final report is expected by mid-October.

Databases**Belarus:**

The project is complete with final reports filed and accepted.

Russia:

This project is essentially complete with interim reports filed. A final report is expected in mid-October. During his mission, the PM reviewed the data base and found it comprehensive and functional.

Monitoring**Belarus:**

This project is completed and final reports filed and accepted.

Russia:

This project is well underway with all field work completed. The interim report has been filed and the final report expected by mid-October. Of note is the recent decision to elevate the protected area that comprises the head of the Dniro basin to the status of a federal protected area.

3.2 Verify Progress in Achieving Results

The overall goal of the Program is :

“...to enhance the capacity of Russia and Belarus to manage the Dnieper River, mainly with regard to participation in the GEF Strategic Action Programme for the Dnieper River Basin (SAPDRB).”

In its originally filed Program-level results framework, OCCEI/IDRC's intent was to report results attainment by activity (or component). The three activities correspond to the objectives of the Program.

1. Promote open, transparent, and efficient management and decision making
2. Assess the current status of the river and its management
3. Enhance information gathering, reliability and accessibility.

In the past (EMDU-2 Program in Ukraine), OECCI/IDRC reported performance using a performance measurement technique that relied on project-level identification of expected results and project-level measurement by identified indicator from an established project baseline. This information was then rolled up to the Program level. There is no evidence that this was being used in any of the projects in Belarus or Russia under the EMDDBR Program. In the EMDU-2 Program, this method met with limited success as project participants were unfamiliar with RBM principles.

In its most recent progress reports, the PM notes that OECCI/IDRC reports on outputs from activities but does not specifically address the identified performance indicators in performance reporting at the Program-level, despite the fact that a full RBM performance regime was developed at the outset of the Program. During the PM's September 2003 monitoring mission, the PM focussed on gathering data for performance measurement by indicator at the expected outcome and impact result levels. In that the Program is close to completion and that output-level performance has been addressed in earlier reports, it was felt that this focus level was appropriate.

As aforementioned, the following commentary regarding results achievement is based on a compendium of data from the PM's earlier mission to Belarus and his most recent monitoring mission, just completed. The PM's findings are based on data collected through monitoring and are an expression of the PM's view of this data's weight further to performance indicators initially established by OECCI/IDRC in the original design of the EMDDBR Program.

3.2.1 Attainment of Expected Outputs

Activity (component) One Promote open, transparent, and efficient management and decision-making practices

First Output: River management bodies

PM Comment (by indicator):

Establishment of Russian and Belarusian Management Committees

Both RMC and BMC are reported to be established and functioning.

Quantity of proposals and outputs vetted by RMC & BMC

The BMC and RMC have reviewed and approved proposals for all of the project activities currently underway. Actual numbers of proposals that were received or rejected has not been reported. From the PM's perspective, it appears that multiple proposals were received by each body, a number of which were approved, some after additional OECCI/IDRC assistance in their formulation. Some, ultimately, did not receive approval.

Comments from RMC and BMC members

There are no specific comments from RMC or BMC members noted in recent progress reporting. The PM has received many positive comments from BMC and RMC members regarding their experience with this management strategy, and their optimism that it was something that would have long-lasting impacts on Belarus and the Dnieper basin.

PM Finding

This expected output result has been attained.

Second Output:

Formulation of objectives and strategies for managing the river

Strong linkages exist between the EMDDBR Program and the GEF SAP initiative. The collaboration between these Programs has aided in achieving mutual goals like the establishment of the BMC and RMC. Key partners identified in Belarus and Russia as part of the EMDDBR will play important roles in the GEF work as well. EMDDBR has been able to take advantage of GEF organised meetings to co-ordinate Program activities and discussions. In the course of work under the EMDDBR, the BMC and RMC, in collaboration with river basin management stakeholders, have worked toward establishing objectives and strategies for managing the river that have been incorporated in the GEF SAP.

PM Comment (by indicator):

Strategy report written

In Belarus, the needs assessment and review of laws has been completed.

In Russia, the needs assessment was cancelled and incorporated into GEF activities. The work has been undertaken further to an outside initiative led by UNIDO. As a consequence, completing the planned work under the EMDDBR program would have been redundant.

PM Finding

In that the planned work has been accomplished, this result is deemed achieved.

Activity (component) Two Assess the current status of the river and its management

First Output: Decision makers determine what has to be done nationally to clean up the river

PM Comment (by indicator):

Needs assessment report and concept paper published

Report issued on national water laws and policies with recommendations

These outputs have been moved up into Activity One of the previous section by OECC/IDRC (as noted in its Progress Report). Needs assessments and concept papers are complete and have been incorporated into the GEF SAP process. The Russian activity dealing with national water laws was cancelled to avoid conflicting with the UNIDO initiative.

PM Finding

This result is deemed achieved.

Second Output: Understanding of local river conditions

All of the baseline studies planned under EMDDBR have been completed. Belarus participated in two such river expeditions and Russia one – the latter. Final reports are complete and accepted by OECC/IDRC.

PM Comment (by indicator):

Baseline information is judged by western experts to meet international standards

No direct evidence is put forward indicating result attainment however the data has been submitted to the GEF SAP process and has been accepted.

Carrying out of baseline study of river water, bottom sediments and flora and fauna

Two comprehensive studies have been undertaken in Belarus and one in Russia.

Reports have been submitted and the projects are considered completed.

PM Finding

Result achieved.

Activity (component) Three Enhance information gathering, reliability, and accessibility

First Output: Purchase and installation of computers and software and appropriate user training to establish computer linkages between river management, research agencies and government.

Second Output: Creation of databases providing information to policy, management and research organisations

Belarus has completed its projects under this Activity. Final reports have been submitted and accepted by OECC/IDRC. In Russia, the first project under this output

is complete and the second, enhancing computer linkages within the Russian Dnipro basin managing institutions, is effectively complete. Data included in both data bases is extensive. The linkages in each country to relevant policy, management and research institutions are extensive.

PM Comment (by indicator) - First output:

Which technologies installed

The activities have used both standard software solutions as well as some custom applications to establish internet-based linkages and GIS databases of river basin information. The PM has had the opportunity to observe and review the work done in Belarus and Russia.

Evaluations by users on training received

Opinions of engineers and managers on uses of new equipment and technology

Although nothing is specifically reported in the progress report, the PM has received positive feedback from managers and technicians involved in the Belarus and Russia projects. Overall, the comments were optimistic and enthusiastic about the work and its greater impact on Belarus and the Dnieper Basin.

PM Comment (by indicator) - Second output:

Amount of data

Extensive relevant river management data has been or is being incorporated into data bases.

Software and hardware used

Standard ArcView GIS software and modern computers were installed and are being used.

Evaluation of relevance and accuracy of data by outside consultant.

There is no direct reporting on independent verification of data. However, data is being supplied to and accepted by the GEF SAP initiative.

Establishment of operational GIS data bases.

As reported, these are being established. The PM has reviewed their operation and confirms their establishment.

Assembled water quality and quantity data

This data has been and is being assembled. It will be complemented by additional data recently acquired under Russian trans-boundary monitoring initiatives and the groundwater assessment activities in the next few months

PM Finding

On balance, in the PM's view, this result can be considered achieved. Essentially, the work has been completed. Final stages will incorporate recently collected data into data bases.

Third Output:

establishment of long term environmental monitoring stations at protected sites such as parks or nature preserves

Such long term monitoring sites have been established.

PM Comment (by indicator):

One monitoring site operating in each country.

At least one such site is operating in Belarus and Russia. In reality there are multiple monitoring sites established.

Evaluations/comments by real and virtual visitors to sites

In Russia, initial field sampling was accomplished co-operatively, with Belarus and Ukraine involvement despite complex logistical challenges. Those who are working on these projects are highly positive regarding the data being acquired at the sites.

PM Finding

Result achieved.

3.2.2 Attainment of Expected Outcomes

Through the cumulative attainment of outputs, progress toward the attainment of outcomes is accomplished. The following are the outcomes and indicators that OECCI/IDRC has identified for the EMDDBR Program:

OUTCOMES	INDICATORS
Readiness of Russia and Belarus to participate in the DREP [i.e. Dnipro River Environmental project – the implementation stage of the SAP] and on a par with Ukraine.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Countries able to produce harmonized objectives to develop the SAP • UNDP expresses satisfaction with progress in developing the SAP • Concept paper written to guide participation in SAPDRB • RMC & BMC use databases to meet information needs
Management committees interface with other river management programmes and bodies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive assessment of relations by the three countries and third party observers • River management committees provide national input in the SAPDRB • Regular meetings with other river management committees
Baseline data used in formulating policy and reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of government reports/papers citing baseline data
Sharing of data among interested organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functioning communications links between river management, research and government organisations • Comments from end users on usefulness and availability of data

In its most recent progress report, OECCI/IDRC offers the following comment: "(...the completion of) These projects [i.e. the projects approved under the Program] will meet the global objective of EMDDBR, that being to contribute to development of capacity for Russia and Belarus to manage the Dnipro river system through participation in the

UNDP/GEF Dnipro River Environmental Project.” However, this statement of achievement is not substantiated by evidence of attainment by performance indicator further to the Program’s performance measurement regime as originally filed. The following represents the PM’s view of expected outcome result achievement, by result and indicator.

Outcome

Readiness of Russia and Belarus to participate in the DREP [i.e. Dnipro River Environmental project – the implementation stage of the SAP] and on a par with Ukraine.

PM Comment (by indicator):

- Countries able to produce harmonised objectives to develop the SAP
EMDDBR has significantly contributed to the countries being able to produce such objectives.
- UNDP expresses satisfaction with progress in developing the SAP
Such satisfaction has been expressed.
- Concept paper written to guide participation in SAPDRB
Such concept papers have been written.
- RMC & BMC use databases to meet information needs
Each country has developed data bases however the data sharing protocols between countries needed to collectively manage the river basin have yet to be developed. This is a sensitive matter; negotiations are ongoing.

PM Finding

Much evidence, by indicator, is in place that points to the achievement of this result. However, the crucial link – that of the protocol that will allow for joint basin management – has yet to be achieved. Note that in the PM’s view and experience, this is often the most difficult aspect of joint management of any resource, whether it be in Canada or elsewhere – due to institutional protection of jurisdiction. At this juncture, in the PM’s opinion, this result cannot be considered achieved until the protocol is in place.

Outcome

Management committees interface with other river management programmes and bodies

PM Comment (by indicator):

- Positive assessment of relations by the three countries and third party observers
There is widespread agreement that positive relations exist between the three countries.
- river management committees provide national input in the SAPDRB
The river management committees provide a quality control function to data and ensure that inputs are directed to the SAPDRB.

- regular meetings with other river management committees
Such meetings are held on a regular basis.

PM Finding

This result is achieved.

Outcome

Baseline data used in formulating policy and reporting

PM Comment (by indicator):

- number of government reports/papers citing baseline data
There is widespread evidence that the baseline data acquired during the river expeditions is being utilised to formulate national policy and is being cited in government reports in all three countries. However, there is no quantification of this.

PM Finding

The PM is of the opinion that this result has been achieved despite the lack of quantification.

Outcome

Sharing of data among interested organisations

PM Comment (by indicator):

- Functioning communications links between river management, research and government organisations
These links are extensive in each country. As aforementioned, inter-country links await the finalisation of necessary protocols for data sharing.
- Comments from end users on usefulness and availability of data
The potential for feedback from end users is extant although the systems, being relatively new, have yet to elicit a widespread response. What is of note, however, is that working groups that established the data bases were characterised by a high level of stakeholder (including end user and non-governmental organisations) participation in all three countries. Consequently, end user satisfaction with the usefulness and availability of data is expected to be high.

PM Finding

In the PM's view due to the ongoing protocol negotiations and relatively newness of the systems, a determination that this result is achieved would be premature.

3.2.3 Attainment of Impact Results

Impact results are the sustainable legacy of a (project) Program, and are not measurable until some time after its completion. Some indication of impact attainment

may be discernible at the Program's conclusion, and commentary from OECCI/IDRC regarding impact attainment would be expected in a Program Final Report. Note that an indication of the GEF SAP's success may be evident before calendar year end as the Program will host a donor's conference in Kyiv.

IDRC's identified impacts for EMDDBR rely on the ultimate success of the GEF initiative:

IMPACTS	INDICATORS
Successful completion of SAPDRB.	UNDP positively evaluates SAPDRB SAPDRB achieves objectives

PM's Finding

The GEF SAP is scheduled for completion by calendar year end. It will then undergo a UNDP evaluation to determine if it has achieved its objectives. It is clear, from the PM's perspective, that the EMDDBR Program has assisted significantly the SAP process.

3.3 Monitor Achievement of Key Success Factors

CIDA's RBM policy identifies Key Success Factors thought necessary for projects to achieve success. These are divided into two categories, Development Factors and Management Factors. The following lists the Success Factors.

A. Development Factors

Relevance

Does the Program make sense in terms of the conditions, needs or problems to which it is intended to respond?

The Program has been highly relevant to the environmental management conditions, needs and problems of the riparian countries of the Dnieper River. Due to the two phases of the EMDU Program implemented in Ukraine, Belarus and Russia lagged behind Ukraine in river basin management methodologies, data and approaches for the two countries to participate on an equal footing in the GEF SAP process. The EMDDBR Program addressed this inequality.

Appropriateness

Are the Program's resources, capacities and selected strategies sensible and sufficient to achieve intended results?

In the PM's view, the Program's resources, capacities and strategies have been sensible and sufficient to achieve its intended results. OCEEI/IDRC has been able to draw heavily on the lessons learned in the EMDU Programs in Ukraine to guide this

Program. It is notable that representatives of the management committees are strong in their endorsement of the OCEEI/IDRC approach, commenting favourably in comparing this initiative to that of other donors.

Cost Effectiveness

Is the relationship between costs and results reasonable?

The PM does not have a mandate to review the actual financial records for the Program. However, the PM is of the view that resources were used in a cost effective manner in that much work has been accomplished in Projects under the Program that, should this have been accomplished directly by Canada-based technical cooperation personnel, the cost would have been much higher, the local capacity building much less. It is the PM's understanding that the Program will end on budget.

Sustainability

Will Program benefits continue after completion of project activities?

Should the GEF SAP be favourably evaluated and move to implementation, the sustainability of this Program's benefits is assured.

Should the SAP prove to be impossible to implement (a low probability eventuality), many of the benefits of the Program should still remain. In particular, those that have been entrenched within each countries' respective water management institutions should fare well. These include the data gathered through sampling which already is incorporated in each countries' base of river management data and the in-country computer and data management linkages.

B. Management Factors

Partnership

Is there shared responsibility and accountability for Program results?

Given the OECCI/IDRC approach where much of the actual work within the Program is the responsibility of Program partners through the implementation of developed and approved Projects, shared responsibility and accountability for successful project implementation is high. Note, however, that OECCI/IDRC's practise of not measuring the attainment of results at the Program level flows through to its partnerships. Projects are developed and implemented but overall Program expectations are not co-operatively framed or shared in the formal sense.

Innovation and Creativity

Does the Program explore new ideas and approaches to achieve its results?

The management techniques and overall technologies applied are innovative and creative in Belarus and Russia. The development of a partnership for river basin

management between Russia, Belarus and Ukraine is highly innovative and creative, and should have significant results both developmentally and environmentally as they continue to work on the GEF initiative.

Appropriate Human Resource Utilisation

Are suitable human resources involved and used well?

In the PM's view, the utilisation of human resources appears appropriate. The interaction of regional experts – particularly those from Ukraine who had already benefited from the EMDU Programs – was highly appropriate. In addition, the high level of interaction between specialists and technicians from all three participating countries is noteworthy.

Prudence and Probity

Is financial information complete, accurate and reliable?

Are financial resources being used economically?

The PM is not mandated to comment on financial information.

Informed and Timely Action

Do we anticipate and respond to change based on adequate information?

The Program is based on an iterative model and projects within it are developed in a responsive manner. Although the Russian project development process lagged – due to both logistical and institutional imperatives of the Russian system exacerbated by the relative low importance of the Dnieper basin within the water resources of the Russian Federation – the Program was able to accommodate these delays while ultimately developing and implementing useful and practical initiatives.

As it became apparent that some originally conceived initiatives would not come to fruition, the Program was able to develop useful and practical alternatives. A good example is the shift of resources to groundwater assessments in Russia and Belarus. These are essentially studies to determine the capacity of sub-surface soils, conglomerates and structures to retain (or not) pollution loads, keeping them from surface (and hence river) waters.

3.4 Monitoring and Reporting Systems

OCEEI/IDRC maintains its practise of reporting on activities undertaken without necessarily associating these specifically with results attainment by performance indicator at the Program level. This has continued despite its filing RBM regimes for approval by CIDA at the outset of Program implementation and contractual obligations with CIDA to so report.

As the PM has noted, this reduces the effectiveness of the reporting within the RBM model and makes it difficult for others to draw lessons learned from initiatives. Through the second phase of EMDU in Ukraine and this Program the PM has noted this practise

in its reporting to CIDA. It should be remembered, however, that through the last phase of the EMDU Program and during the EMDDBR Program, CIDA experienced an extremely high rate of Project Team Leader (PTL) turnover in respect of these Programs.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS

Further to the foregoing, the PM arrives at the following conclusions:

- Although Russian projects were slow to develop and approve, these initiatives are now coming to positive conclusions. Belarus projects have performed exceedingly well. Russia's inability to move quickly on project proposals is a reflection of recent governmental changes in responsibility for environmental management overall and institutional wrangling over jurisdictions both centrally and regionally. In addition, the relative importance of the Dnieper River basin in Russia compared to other Russian river basins is very low. The RMC therefore developed and put forward a strategy whereby regional authorities based in Smolensk (the main administrative site in the upper Dnieper basin) would take a large share of responsibility for project development and implementation under the Program. The development and implementation of this strategy took considerable time but, in the PM's view, offers greater scope for sustainability in the medium to long term. By contrast, the Dnieper River in Belarus and certainly Ukraine is of far greater significance nationally, and management of the river basin a more pressing, central imperative.
- In the EMDU Program phases in Ukraine, the primary developmental objective was to break down traditional Soviet-style vertical governmental structures for environmental management, particularly for river management. This was accomplished by effecting horizontally-shared responsibilities between vertically established institutions through the development and implementation of projects under the Programs. Civil society was also strengthened through the inclusion of non-governmental organisations. The EMDDBR Program has emulated this model in Russia and Belarus, to the relative extent of available resources.
- However, the EMDDBR Program is predicated on trans-boundary co-operation in river basin management. It is one step to develop horizontal linkages within the country, and another to make such linkages between countries. On the working level, the EMDDBR Program achieved considerable success in this regard in that a number of projects saw collaboration between each countries' specialists and technicians. The more important test is the ultimate agreement on data sharing protocols for river management, still under negotiation. Not only are the traditional imperatives of jurisdictional jealousy to be overcome, there are specific legal constraints to data sharing that will need to be addressed.
- In the PM's view, performance by indicator at the Program level suggests all Program output results have been attained and that two of four outcome results

have also been attained. The other two outcome results are near to attainment, and are primarily dependent on the negotiation of a workable data sharing arrangement between the countries.

- There are indications of impact result attainment; ultimately, however, this is dependent on the success of the GEF SAP initiative. This planning initiative is coming to a conclusion. An important aspect of this conclusion is a donor's conference tentatively scheduled for November of this year. The objective of such a conference is to inform the donor community of the elements of the SAP and to preliminarily determine interest in financing aspects of its implementation. The PM anticipates that the SAP will contain a strong measure of infrastructure improvements that will be proffered to the international financial institution (IFI) community with attendant policy (including water tariff) reform requirements upon the governments of Ukraine, Belarus and Russia. This expectation was confirmed by the PM in discussions with the Ukraine representative of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) whose Bank has been following the development of the SAP.
- Successful implementation through the attraction of investment in water management technologies will require a strong measure of policy reform, a politically difficult challenge and one representative of the type of challenges these governments have not addressed. It is to be noted, however, that IFIs have recently tempered their investment strategies and are not insistent on major steps to full privatisation prior to investment. There appears a willingness to consider policy reform in a series of steps so long as progress is being made in a preferred direction. There is, therefore, additional scope for suggesting IFI interest in financing aspects of the SAP is freshening. Corresponding movement on the part of governments toward policy reform, at the national and municipal level, will be required. Note that should the GEF SAP garner the support for a measure of implementation, the GEF itself will provide implementation funds for the trans-boundary aspects of implementation.
- CIDA, through the EMDU and EMBBDR Programs, has made a strong investment in river basin management that does contribute to sustainable development. Canadian entities, public and private, possess the river basin management technologies required to implement the GEF SAP, and should be well positioned to take advantage of opportunities that will arise from its implementation. Should this transpire, it offers the return on investment already made.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Further to the PM's assessment and stated conclusions, it is recommended that:

1. The final determination of results attainment under the Program be forestalled until the actual conclusion of the Program. The two outcome results as yet unattained

may very well be fully attained by this time. Final reports submitted by OECCI/IDRC will address the outcome of negotiations on data sharing between the countries.

2. CIDA attend the scheduled GEF SAP donors conference to acquire an indication of the willingness of both donors and national governments in the implementation of the SAP.
3. CIDA consider new cost effective initiatives and offer its support within current programs that will assist Canadian entities in participating in the implementation of the GEF SAP so as to facilitate the return on investment already made.

Appendix A**CONTACTS MADE DURING MISSION**

Name	Position
Mr. Y.C. Pan	Counsellor and Head of Technical Cooperation Section, Canadian Embassy, Ukraine
Mr. M. Lahola	Director of Representative Office, IDRC, Environmental Management Development in Ukraine, Russia, Belarus
Ms. O. Rudenko	Program Coordinator, IDRC, Environmental Management Development in Ukraine, Russia, Belarus
Mr. L. Markevych	Project Manager, UNDP, Dnipro Basin Environment Programme
Mr. N. Mikheev	Deputy Minister, Ministry of Natural Resources, Russian Federation
Mr. E. Reznik	Deputy General Director, VODNIIINFORMPROEKT, Office Head, Russian Management Committee
Mr. A. Aleshukin	Technical Coordinator, VODNIIINFORMPROEKT
Mr. Anuchkin	Deputy Director, Federal State Organisation, Ministry of Natural Resources
Mrs. A. Belousova	Project Head, Assessment of Potential for Ground Water Protection Project
Mr. V. Petukhov	Project Head, Establishment of Stations for Environmental Monitoring of Nature Reserves Project
Mr. A. Bissyukov	Deputy Head, Dneiper Renaissance Fund
Mr. K. Zahariev	Director, Ukraine, European Bank for Reconstruction and Redevelopment (EBRD)